

MARKED UP VERSION OF THE AMENDED CLAIMS

(Version with marking to show changes made)

1. (amended) An improved arrangement to configure construction components characterised on being constituted as from [the] a combination of plastic and metal, consisting of a plastic enveloping casting (2) or (12) or (22) or (32) or (42) or (52) or (62) or (72) or (82) or (92) or (102) or (112) surrounding [and] an internal metallic structure (3) or (13) or (23) or (33) or (43) or (53) or (63) or (73) or (83) or (93) or (103) or (113), incorporating a metallic laminate or plate (4) and (4') or (84) or (114) and (114') for reinforcement in [the] bolted joints.

2. (amended) An improved arrangement to configure construction components, according to the first claim, characterised in that [the] a resulting combination may adopt [the] a form [or] of rails and beams (1), pipes (10), rods (20), channels (30), angles (40), flatbars (50), "Z" (60), profiles (70), beams (80), corrugated plates (90), smooth plates (100) or structures (110).

3. (new) A construction component comprising an internal metallic structure exhibiting a planar face; a metallic laminate disposed parallel to the planar face; a plastic enveloping casting surrounding the internal metallic structure and the metallic laminate; bolted joints passing through the metallic laminate, wherein the metallic laminate furnishes a reinforcement.

4. (new) The construction component according to claim 3, wherein the construction component assumes a form of rails and beams (1), pipes (10), or rods (20).

5. (new) The construction component according to claim 3, wherein the construction component assumes a form of channels (30), angles (40), flatbars (50), or "Z"-shapes (60).

6. (new) The construction component according to claim 3, wherein the construction component assumes a form of profiles (70), or beams (80).

7. (new) The construction component according to claim 3, wherein the construction component assumes a form of corrugated plates (90), smooth plates (100) or structures (110).

8. (new) An I-beam structure comprising
a metallic I-beam having an upper face and having a lower face;
a first metallic laminate disposed above the upper face at a distance;
a second metallic laminate disposed below the lower face at a second distance;
a cast plastic envelope surrounding the metallic I-beam and the metallic laminate and having an outer shape of an I-beam.

REMARKS

Claims 1 through 2 continue to be in the case.

New claims 3 through 8 are being submitted.

Claims 1 and 2 are being amended.

The new claims have the following basis:

New claim Basis

3 claim 1

4 claim2

5 claim 2

6 claim 2

7 claim 2

8 Fig. 2 and specification.

The Office Action on page 1, point 13 kindly acknowledges applicant's claim for priority.

However, the Office Action on page 1, point 13 does not acknowledge the receipt of certified copies of applicant's priority documents.

While the instant application is a PCT-application, such priority documents are usually furnished by the World Intellectual Property

Organization. The applicant is at a loss in understanding as to why these documents are not part of the file. The Examiner's help is respectfully solicited as to what the situation is with the priority documents and as to what the applicant has to do to complete his claim for priority.

The Office Action refers to *Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112*

Claim 1 recites the limitation "the combination" in line 3. There is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claim.

Claim 1 recites the limitation "the bolted joints" in lines 10-11. There is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claim.

Claim 2 recites the limitation "the resulting combination" in line 3. There is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claim.

Claim 2 recites the limitation "the form" in line 3. There is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claim.

Claims 1 and 2 have been corrected now to provide proper antecedant basis.

Claim 1 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the

subject matter which applicant regards as the invention. Claim 1 includes various component numbers but does not particularly disclose the limitations of the invention.

New claim 3 is being submitted to avoid some possible shortcomings of claim 1.

The claims are generally narrative and indefinite, failing to conform with current U.S. practice. They appear to be a literal translation into English from a foreign document and are replete with grammatical and idiomatic errors.

New claims 3 through 8 are being submitted and it is believed that these new claims are definite and conform to current US practice.

The Office action refers to Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

Claims 1 and 2 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 3,810,337 to Pollard. Pollard discloses a structural member comprised of a plastic core (fig. 1: 38) having embedded reinforcing rods (fig. 1: 26) and metal end plates (fig. 1: 20).

Claim 1 requires "a plastic enveloping casting surrounding an internal metallic structure".

In contrast, the reference Pollard teaches in column 2, lines 46 to 48:

"The lightweight void-containing material is shown at 38 and in final condition is adhered and bonded to the inner surfaces of the skin sheets.".

While claim 1 of the present application requires that the plastic enveloping casting is surrounding a metallic internal structure, the Pollard reference teaches that the void-containing material is adhered to inner surfaces. Thus the position of the material is on the inside in the Pollard reference and on the outside according to claim 1. Thus claim 1 clearly defines the invention over the Pollard reference.

Applicant submits that the prior art made of record neither anticipates nor renders obvious the present invention.

Reconsideration of all outstanding rejections is respectfully requested.

If the Examiner should not be able to find a certain element of Applicants' claims in a search of the state of the art and such element is deemed by the Examiner to be necessary for forming a basis for a rejection, then the Examiner is invited to inform the Applicant of such element in order to allow the Applicant to fully meet their disclosure requirement in view of innumerable and hypothetical possibilities of combining references to allege obviousness of individual claims. In particular, in view of different

levels of familiarity of inventors with the information disclosure requirements of the United States Patent and Trademark Office developed in recent years and apparently still developing, which disclosure requirements are believed to be unique in the world, any help and suggestions regarding possible problems seen by the Examiner are welcome.

All claims as presently submitted are deemed to be in form for allowance and an early notice of allowance is earnestly solicited.

Respectfully submitted,

Marion Enrique SANCHEZ NINA

By: Horst M. Kasper
Horst M. Kasper, his attorney
13 Forest Drive, Warren, N.J. 07059
Telephone: (908)757-2839
Telefax: (908)668-5262
Reg.No. 28559; Docket No.: GES201A1

/sn-am/rep